



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,717	12/13/2001	Kelan Craig Silvester	42390P13449	9538

7590 05/03/2005

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF,
TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

LEE, CHRISTOPHER E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2112

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,717

Applicant(s)

SILVESTER, KELAN CRAIG

Examiner

Christopher E. Lee

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Receipt Acknowledgement***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed on 14th of February 2005. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 17 have been amended; no claim has been canceled; and no claim has been newly added since the Non-Final Office Action was mailed on 12th of January 2005. Currently, claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Substitute "A apparatus" by --An apparatus-- in line 1.

10 Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dickie [US 6,798,647 B2].

15 *Referring to claim 17*, Dickie discloses a multiprocessor computing system (i.e., portable computing system with multiple processors 400 and 410 in Fig. 4) comprising: a first computing unit (i.e., PDA 102 of Fig. 1) comprising a first processor (i.e., Processor 400 of Fig. 4) and a second computing unit (i.e., Portable Computer 104 of Fig. 1) comprising a second processor (i.e., Processor 410 of Fig. 4); said first and second computing units (e.g., PDA and Notebook Computer) designed to mate together to form a singular combined computing unit (i.e., Portable Computing system 100 in Fig. 1; See col. 3, lines 8-21) to form a mobile notebook computer (i.e., Notebook Computer body 112 of Fig. 1; See col. 2, lines 36-42 and col. 3, lines 3-7), wherein said first and second computing units are physically coupled together during a mated mode (i.e., during docked; See col. 3, lines 8-10), and wherein said first and second computing units are not physically coupled together during a detached mode (i.e., during undocked; See

20

col. 3, lines 1-3); and wherein said first and second computing units operate together (i.e., synchronized operation) as a single computer (i.e., computing system 100 in Fig. 1) during said mated mode (i.e., during docked; See col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 8), and said first and second computing units each operate as an individual computer (i.e., PDA and Notebook Computer are not only unsynchronized, but also working independently) during said detached mode (i.e., during undocked; See col. 5, lines 9-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. [US 6,473,789 B1; hereinafter Chen] in view of Howell et al. [US 5,754,397 A; hereinafter Howell].

Referring to claim 1, Chen discloses an apparatus (i.e., an embodiment of Chen's invention shown in Fig. 1) comprising: a first computer (i.e., desktop computer 20 of Fig. 1) comprising a first processor (i.e., CPU 21 of Fig. 1) housed in a first case (i.e., a case of said desktop computer), said first processor to execute a first set of instructions (See col. 2, lines 54-58; i.e., said desktop computer executes its own software); a second computer (i.e., notebook computer 10 of Fig. 1) comprising a second processor (i.e., CPU 11 of Fig. 1) housed in a second case (i.e., a case of said notebook computer), said second processor to execute a second set of instructions (See col. 2, lines 49-54; i.e., said notebook computer executes its own software); a docking connector (i.e., Computer Coupling Device of the Invention 100 of Fig. 1) coupled to said first case and said second case (i.e., said Computer Coupling Device 100 is coupled to said desktop computer 20 and said notebook computer 10 in Fig. 1), said docking connector (i.e., Computer Coupling Device) to mate (i.e., connect) said first computer and said second computer together (See col. 3, lines 2-5), said docking connector to propagate electrical signals between said first processor and said second processor when said first case is physically docked to said second case (See col. 3, line 54 through col. 4, line 15), and wherein said first computer and said second

computer operate together as a multiprocessor computer system (i.e., dual-CPU parallel processing system) when said first computer and said second computer are mated (See col. 4, lines 16-27), and wherein said first computer and said second computer operate as separate computers when said first computer and said second computer are not mated (See col. 1, lines 18-26; i.e., wherein in fact that these two computer types (e.g., notebook computer and desktop computer) are based on different specifications and standards inherently anticipates that said first computer and said second computer operate as separate computers when said first computer and said second computer are not mated).

Chen does not expressly teach that said docking connector is a hinged docking connector.

Howell discloses a docking connector (See col. 1, lines 5-10), wherein a hinged docking connector (i.e., connector 32 and door 36 in Fig. 2; See col. 2, line 52 through col. 3, line 24) coupled to a first case (i.e., base 16 of Fig. 6) and a second case (i.e., docking tray 46 of Fig. 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted said hinged docking connector, as disclosed by Howell, for said docking connector (i.e., Computer Coupling Device of the Invention), as disclosed by Chen, for the advantage of providing a variable height adjustment capability between said docking connector of said first computer and said mating connector of said second computer (i.e., an associated docking tray; See Howell, col. 1, lines 39-42).

7. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen [US 6,473,789 B1] in view of Howell [US 5,754,397 A] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kilp [US 6,463,142 B1].

Referring to claim 2, Chen, as modified by Howell, discloses all the limitations of the claim 2, except that does not teach said first computer comprising a first wireless transceiver to send and receive wireless communications.

Kilp discloses a messaging system (See Abstract), wherein a first computer (i.e., stationary unit 15 of Fig. 1) comprising a first wireless transceiver (e.g., transceiver of Bluetooth standard, Home RF standard, or IrDA link) to send and receive wireless communications (See col. 3, lines 21-30 and col. 6, line 61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included said messaging system, as disclosed by Kilp, in said apparatus, as disclosed by Chen, as modified by Howell, for the advantage of providing automatic proxy services for routing data messages, and thus users of said apparatus (i.e., messaging system) need not worry about manually changing between said first computer and said second computer (i.e., stationary and mobile) connections to said communications (i.e., message service) when leaving the office area (See Kilp, col. 6, lines 48-58).

Referring to claim 3, Kilp teaches said second computer (i.e., mobile unit 20 of Fig. 1) comprising a second wireless transceiver (e.g., transceiver of Bluetooth standard, Home RF standard, or IrDA link) to send and receive wireless communications (See col. 3, lines 21-30 and col. 6, lines 62-64).

Referring to claim 4, Kilp teaches said first computer (i.e., stationary unit 15 of Fig. 1) and said second computer (i.e., mobile unit 20 of Fig. 1) communicate together wirelessly (See col. 3, lines 21-30) when said first computer and said second computer are not mated together (in fact, said mobile unit and said stationary unit are not mated (viz., physically disconnected) when the communication link is based on Bluetooth/RF standards, IrDA link).

Referring to claim 5, Chen teaches said first computer (i.e., desktop computer 20 of Fig. 1) comprising a keyboard mounted within said first case (i.e., KBD of said desktop computer 20 in Fig. 1), said keyboard (i.e., KBD) to receive user input (i.e., keyboard input via said KBD of said desktop computer 20 in Fig. 1).

8. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen [US 6,473,789 B1] in view of Howell [US 5,754,397 A] and Kilp [US 6,463,142 B1] as applied to claims 2-5 above, and further in view of Armitage et al. [US 6,157,958 A; cited by the Applicant; hereinafter Armitage].

Referring to claim 6, Chen, as modified by Howell and Kilp, discloses all the limitations of the claim 6, including said first computer (i.e., desktop computer 20 of Fig. 1; Chen) can independently operate as a server (See Chen, col. 1, line 65 through col. 2, line 2; i.e., wherein in fact that the computer coupling device connects the Host bus and the PCI bus of the notebook computer respectively to the Host bus and the PCI bus of the desktop computer when the notebook computer (e.g., client computer) wants to gain access to the system resource of the desktop computer (e.g., server computer) implies said first computer (i.e., desktop computer) can independently operate as a server (i.e., server computer for resource sharing)), except that does not expressly teach said first computer is a base computer, said base computer to serve as a bottom half of a notebook computer system.

Armitage discloses a modular tablet computer system (See Abstract and Figs. 1 and 2), wherein a first computer (i.e., base unit 104 of Figs. 1 and 2) is a base computer (See col. 9, lines 16-35), said base computer to serve as a bottom half of a notebook computer system (i.e., a bottom half of said modular tablet computer system; See Figs. 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied said modular tablet computer system, as disclosed by Armitage, to said apparatus, as disclosed by Chen, as modified by Kilp, for the advantage of providing a housing for said apparatus (i.e., computer system) that provides an ergonomic structure and facilitates mobility of said apparatus (i.e., system; See Armitage, col. 2, lines 33-35).

Referring to claim 7, Armitage teaches said second computer (i.e., tablet computer system 102 of Figs. 1 and 2) comprising a display screen (i.e., display unit 118 of Fig. 1) mounted within said second case (See col. 4, lines 30-60), said display screen to output information (i.e., display screen output information via said display unit 118 in Fig. 1).

Referring to claim 8, Armitage teaches said second computer (i.e., tablet computer system 102 of Figs. 1 and 2) is a tablet computer (See col. 4, lines 30-42), said tablet computer to serve as a top half of

said notebook computer system (i.e., a top half of said modular tablet computer system; See Figs. 1 and 2).

Referring to claim 9, Chen teaches that said first processor (i.e., CPU 21 of Fig. 1) is a primary processor for said multiprocessor system (i.e., dual-CPU parallel processing system) when said first computer and said second computer are mated together (See col. 4, lines 16-33 and col. 6, lines 5-8), and wherein said keyboard (i.e., KBD of said desktop computer 20 in Fig. 1) and said display screen (i.e., display device resource on said notebook computer 10m in Fig. 1) are controlled by said first processor (i.e., CPU 21 of Fig. 1; in fact, the desktop computer can gain access to the devices on the notebook computer, in other words, the display device on the notebook computer being controlled by the CPU of the desktop computer after gaining the access of the display device resource; See col. 2, lines 60-62), said keyboard to send any input received to said first processor (i.e., keyboard input via said KBD of said desktop computer 20 being sent to said CPU 21 in Fig. 1) and said display screen (i.e., display device on said notebook computer) to display data from said first processor (in fact, accessed said display device on said notebook computer being able to output said KBD of the desktop computer input).

Referring to claim 10, Kilp teaches said first computer (i.e., stationary unit 15 of Fig. 1) is coupled to a network (i.e., network 30 of Fig. 1), said first computer to operate as a server (i.e., base unit; See col. 1, lines 7-10) when said first computer (i.e., stationary unit 15 of Fig. 1) and said second computer (i.e., mobile unit 20 of Fig. 1) are not mated together (i.e., no communication link; See col. 5, lines 14-16), and resources of said first computer are available (See col. 5, lines 17-31).

9. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickie [US 6,798,647 B2] in view of what was well known in the art, as exemplified by Toshiro et al. [JP 2000-284712; hereinafter Toshiro].

Referring to claim 11, Dickie discloses a mobile computer system (i.e., portable computing system 100 in Fig. 1; See Abstract) comprising: a tablet personal computer (PC, i.e., PDA 102 of Fig. 1)

comprising a display screen (i.e., Display Area 202 of Fig. 2), a first processor (i.e., Processor 400 of Fig. 4), and a first wireless transceiver (See col. 3, lines 55-61; i.e., IR or RF transceiver); a base computer module (i.e., Portable Computer 104 of Fig. 1) comprising an integral keyboard (i.e., Keyboard 114 on said portable computer 104 in Fig. 1), a second processor (i.e., Processor 410 of Fig. 4), and a second wireless transceiver (See col. 3, lines 55-61; i.e., IR or RF transceiver); and a mating connector (i.e., Electrical Contacts 310 of Fig. 3) to couple together said tablet PC (i.e., PDA) and said base computer module (e.g., Notebook Computer) in a clamshell configuration (i.e., docking cradle configuration in Fig. 3), wherein said tablet PC (i.e., PDA) and said base computer (i.e., Notebook Computer) operate together as a multiprocessor computer system (i.e., software being executed on one or more processors) while said tablet PC and said base computer module are physically mated (i.e., docked; See col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 8), and wherein said tablet PC and said base computer module operate separately as stand-alone computers (i.e., PDA and Notebook Computer are not only unsynchronized, but also working independently) while said tablet PC and said base computer module are not mated together (i.e., undocked; See col. 5, lines 9-17).

Dickie does not expressly teach said display screen is a liquid crystal display (LCD).

The Examiner takes Official Notice that said display screen is a liquid crystal display (LCD), what is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art, as evidenced by Toshiro, such that a tablet personal computer (PC, i.e., small personal digital assistant equipment 30 of Fig. 1) comprises a display screen (i.e., Liquid Crystal Display with Touch Panel 1 of Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied liquid crystal display (LCD) for said display screen since it would have provided a light weight and a low power consumption.

Referring to claim 12, Dickie teaches said LCD screen display screen (i.e., Display Area 202 of Fig. 2) comprising a touch-sensitive panel covering said LCD screen (i.e., Touch Screen 204 of Fig. 2), said touch-sensitive panel to receive user input (See col. 2, lines 59-62).

Referring to claim 13, Dickie teaches said tablet PC (i.e., PDA 102 of Fig. 1) and said base computer module (i.e., Portable Computer 104 of Fig. 1) mate together into a notebook computer form factor (i.e., Notebook Computer System 100 in Fig. 1), said tablet PC (i.e., PDA) as an upper half (i.e., half processing function, viz., PDA function, being on the upper part of Notebook Computer System) of a notebook case (i.e., body 112 in Fig. 1) and said base computer module (i.e., Notebook Computer) as a bottom half (i.e., half processing function, viz., portable computer function, being on the bottom part of Notebook Computer System) of said notebook case (i.e., body; See col. 3, lines 22-27).

Referring to claim 14, Dickie teaches said first processor (i.e., Processor 400 of Fig. 4) and said second processor (i.e., Processor 410 of Fig. 4) operate together during a multiprocessor mode (i.e., during docked state) to execute instructions and process data (i.e., software being executed on one or more processors; See col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 8),

Referring to claim 15, Dickie teaches said tablet PC (i.e., PDA 102 of Fig. 1) and said base computer module (i.e., Portable Computer 104 of Fig. 1) communicate with each other wirelessly to share data (See col. 3, lines 14-17; i.e., proximity coupling, IR coupling, RF coupling, etc.).

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickie [US 6,798,647 B2] as applied to claims 11-15 above, and further in view of Kilp [US 6,463,142 B1].

Referring to claim 16, Dickie discloses all the limitations of the claim 16, except that does not teach that said base computer module is coupled to a network, said base computer module to operate as a server machine on said network, and said base computer to further provide network access to said tablet PC.

Kilp discloses a messaging system (See Abstract), wherein a base computer module (i.e., stationary unit 15 of Fig. 1) is coupled to a network (i.e., network 30 of Fig. 1), said base computer module (i.e., stationary unit) to operate as a server machine on said network (i.e., base unit on said network; See col. 1, lines 7-10), and said base computer module (i.e., stationary unit) to further provide network access to a tablet PC (i.e., mobile unit 20 of Fig. 1; See col. 5, lines 14-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included said messaging system, as disclosed by Kilp, in said mobile computer system (i.e., portable computing system), as disclosed by Dickie, for the advantage of providing automatic proxy services for routing data messages, and thus users of messaging system need not worry about manually changing between said base computer module and said tablet personal computer (i.e., stationary and mobile) connections to said communications (i.e., message service) when leaving the office area (See Kilp, col. 6, lines 48-58).

11. Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickie [US 6,798,647 B2] as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Chen [US 6,473,789 B1].

15 *Referring to claim 18*, Dickie discloses all the limitations of the claim 18, including said first computing unit (i.e., PDA 102 of Fig. 1) is a master (i.e., having a main processor 410 of Fig. 4; See col. 4, lines 26-31), except that does not teach said first computing unit takes primary control of system resources during said mated mode.

Chen discloses a notebook/desktop docking system (See Abstract and Fig. 2), wherein a first computing unit (i.e., desktop computer 20 of Fig. 1) is a master (in other words, master/slave relationship established) and takes primary control of system resources during said mated mode (See col. 4, lines 16-33 and col. 6, lines 5-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included said master/slave relationship, as disclosed by Chen, to said multiprocessor

computing system (i.e., portable computing system with multiple processors), as disclosed by Dickie, for the advantage of allowing said respective microprocessors (i.e., CPUs) of said coupled computer systems to be combined to performed the function of dual-CPU parallel processing (See Chen, col. 1, lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 19, Dickie teaches said first computing unit (i.e., PDA 102 of Fig. 4)

5 comprises a first wireless transceiver (i.e., Interface 404 of Fig. 4; in fact, proximity coupling, IR coupling, RF coupling, etc.; See col. 3, lines 14-17) and said second computing unit (i.e., Portable Computer 104 of Fig. 4) comprises a second wireless transceiver (i.e., Interface 414 of Fig. 4; in fact, proximity coupling, IR coupling, RF coupling, etc.; See col. 3, lines 14-17), said first and second
10 computing units (i.e., said PDA and Portable Computer) to communicate via said first and second wireless transceivers (i.e., said proximity coupling, IR coupling, RF coupling, etc.) to transfer and share data (See col. 3, lines 17-21).

12. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickie [US 6,798,647 B2] in view of Chen [US 6,473,789 B1], as applied to claims 18 and 19 above, and further in view of Kilp [US 6,463,142 B1].

15 *Referring to claim 20*, Dickie, as modified by Chen, discloses all the limitations of the claim 20, except that does not teach that said first computing unit is coupled to a network, said first computing unit to provide network access to said second computing unit during said detached mode via wireless communications.

Kilp discloses a messaging system (See Abstract), wherein a first computing unit (i.e., stationary unit 15
20 of Fig. 1) is coupled to a network (i.e., network 30 of Fig. 1), said first computing unit (i.e., stationary unit) to provide network access to a second computing unit (i.e., mobile unit 20 of Fig. 1) during a detached mode (i.e., no communication link; See col. 5, lines 14-16) via wireless communications (e.g., via cellular protocol; See col. 3, lines 40-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included said messaging system, as disclosed by Kilp, in said multiprocessor computer system (i.e., portable computing system), as disclosed by Dickie, for the advantage of providing automatic proxy services for routing data messages, and thus users of messaging system need not worry about manually changing between said base computer module and said tablet personal computer (i.e., stationary and mobile) connections to said communications (i.e., message service) when leaving the office area (See Kilp, col. 6, lines 48-58).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 14th of February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant's argument with respect to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) on the Response pages 7 and 8, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In contrary to the Applicant's statement, Chen teaches that a desktop computer executes its own software, e.g., an operating system for dual-CPU parallel processing, which is executed on said desktop computer (See col. 2, lines 54-58 and col. 4, lines 15-27), and a notebook computer executes its own software, e.g., an operating system for dual-CPU parallel processing, which is executed on said notebook computer (See col. 2, lines 49-54 and col. 4, lines 15-27). Furthermore, Chen clearly describes that said desktop computer and said notebook computer are coupled by the computer coupling device in order to allow two computers, actually two CPUs of said two computers, to communicate with each other for exchanging of data during the execution of the dual-CPU parallel processing, which inherently anticipates that said desktop computer and said notebook computer have generated said data by the execution of their own software, respectively.

Therefore, Chen clearly teaches all of the limitations in the claimed invention in the original claim 1, and the Applicant's argument on this point is not persuasive.

In addition, the Applicant's argument with respect to claim 1, i.e., Chen does not make a prima facie showing anticipation regarding a "hinged docking connector", which is claimed on the amended claim 1 has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground of rejection. The Examiner brought Howell reference in the rejection for the limitation which is not provided by Chen and all of the other art cited

5 (See paragraph 6 of the instant Office Action, claim 1 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Howell).

In response to the Applicant's argument with respect to "the Kilp '142 reference is not analogous art" on the Response page 9, lines 3-10, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In contrary to the Applicant's statement, Kilp suggests a computing system (i.e., communication system
10 10 for computers, such as stationary unit 15, mobile unit 20, remote unit, etc. in Fig. 1), which includes a first computer (i.e., mobile unit 20 of Fig. 1) and a second computer (i.e., stationary unit 15 of Fig. 1). In fact, the primary reference Chen clearly teaches the claimed subject matters said first and second computers (See paragraph 7 of the instant Office Action, claims 2-5 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Howell and Kilp).

15 Furthermore, the Applicant additionally argues that Kilp reference relied on in a rejection is inapplicable or cannot be combined because it does not relate to solving the same problem that the Applicant is addressing in its claimed invention (i.e., NOT the object of the claimed invention). The motivation to do what the Applicant has done, however, does not have to be the same as the Applicant's to reach a conclusion of obviousness (See MPEP 2144). In addition, the obviousness is not determined on the basis
20 of purpose alone. *In re Graf*, 343 F.2d 774, 777, 145 USPQ 197, 199 (CCPA 1965). In summary, as long as there is some suggestion/motivation within the prior art(s) to make the modification or combination, it does not have to be the same as the Applicant's.

Thus, the Applicant's argument on this point is not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant's argument with respect to "the Office Action does not state a proper motivation to combine the references Chen '789 and Kilp '142" on the Response page 9, lines 11-22, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In contrary to the Applicant's statement, all the rejections under 35 USC §103(a) in the prior and the instant Office Action established a *prima facie* case of obviousness meeting the three basic criteria of the MPEP 2143.03. Furthermore, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In particular, the Applicant asserts that the Applicant must disagree since the application does not even mention the providing of automatic proxy services, and further the mere fact that a reference can be modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.

However, the motivation to do what the Applicant has done does not have to be the same as the Applicant's to reach a conclusion of obviousness (See MPEP 2144), and the obviousness is not determined on the basis of purpose alone. *In re Graf*, 343 F.2d 774, 777, 145 USPQ 197, 199 (CCPA 1965).

In this case, the Examiner has clearly pointed out rationale for appropriate combination of the references.

Thus, the Applicant's argument on this point is not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant's argument with respect to "Chen '789 teaches away from a combination with Kilp '142" on the Response page 10, lines 1-22, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In contrary to the Applicant's statement, Kilp clearly states not only "messages are exchanged via proxy server for said mobile and stationary units using network" in col. 4, lines 42-50, but also "a

communication link is established between said mobile unit and said stationary unit for communicating each other” in col. 3, lines 11-30. In other words, the combining Chen with Kilp does not suggest a linking both the claimed subject matters “first computer” and “second computer” to a network hub, but a linking both the claimed subject matters “first computer” and “second computer” through the claimed subject matters “docking connector” using “wireless” with the nexus of the combination, such that Kilp’s automatic proxy services for message delivery.

Thus, the Applicant’s argument on this point is not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant’s argument with respect to the amended claim 6 on the Response page 11, line 1 through page 12, line 2, having been considered but being moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

In fact, the claimed limitation in the amended claim 6, i.e., said first computer can independently operate as a server, is clearly suggested by Chen of the prior art of the record, such that the desktop computer 20 of Fig. 1 (i.e., first computer) can independently operate as a server (i.e., means for serving system resource) when the notebook computer (i.e., first computer; e.g., client computer) wants to gain access to the system resource of the desktop computer (i.e., second computer; e.g., server computer), which is disclosed in col. 1, line 65 through col. 2, line 2.

Thus, the Applicant’s argument on this point is moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

The Applicant’s arguments with respect to claims 11-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant’s disclosure.
- Hwang et al. [US 5,577,205 A] disclose chassis for a multiple computer system.
- Karidis et al. [US 6,362,440 B1] disclose flexible interfactable portable computing device.

Stoye [US 5,969,696 A] discloses standard interface system between different LCD panels and a common frame buffer output.

Tyuluman [US 5,680,536 A] discloses dual motherboard computer system.

Dewa et al. [US 6,425,040 B1] disclose LAN docker unlocking system.

5 Flint et al. [US 5,608,608 A] disclose cartridge-based design for portable and fixed computers.

Boehme et al. [US 6,512,670 B1] disclose detachable displays or portable devices.

Chen [US 6,404,622 B1] discloses portable computer housing.

Wong [US 6,398,564 B1] discloses communication connector for compact computer devices.

15. The Examiner refers to Toshiro et al. [JP 2000-284712] reference as a prior art for the claim
10 rejection(s) in the instant Office Action, and it is referred to the original copy of foreign reference in foreign language (i.e., Japanese). The Examiner attaches a machine translated copy of the reference for the convenience of the Applicant. However, the Examiner cautions the Applicant that the Office is not responsible for any erroneous interpretation resulting from inaccuracies between the original foreign language reference and the machine translation of the reference, as the machine translation may not
15 reflect the original precisely.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

20 A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3637. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark H. Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher E. Lee
Examiner
Art Unit 2112

cel/ *cel*


Glenn A. Auve
Primary Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100